

November 11, 2004  
Case No. PHF 99,598 (7790/322)  
Serial No.: 09/551,816  
Filed: April 18, 2000  
Page 6 of 10

**REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES**

In the Final Office Action of August 11, 2004, Examiner Ferris rejected pending claims 7-18 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the present application under 37 CFR § 1.114:

- A. Examiner Ferris rejected claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by WO 98/29968 to *Bradley et al.*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Ferris' remarks concerning the patentability of claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17 over *Bradley*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Bradley*. To warrant this 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17, *Bradley* must show each and every limitation of independent claims 7, 110, 13 and 16 in as complete detail as in contained in independent claims 7, 110, 13 and 16. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully asserts that *Bradley* fails to disclose and teaches away from "selection means for based on the acquired data, conditionally selecting at least an active secondary station and conditionally selecting at least an alternative secondary station suitable for becoming active" as recited in independent claims 7 and 13, "based on the acquired data, conditionally selecting at least an active secondary station and conditionally selecting at least an alternative secondary station suitable for becoming active" as recited in independent claim 10; and "based on the acquired data, conditionally select at least an active secondary station and conditionally select at least an alternative secondary station suitable for becoming active" as recited in independent claim 16.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 7, 10, 13 and 16 under §102(b) as being anticipated by *Bradley* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 8 depends from independent claim 7. Therefore, dependent claim 8 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 7. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 8 is allowable over *Bradley* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent

November 11, 2004  
Case No. PHF 99,598 (7790/322)  
Serial No.: 09/551,816  
Filed: April 18, 2000  
Page 7 of 10

claim 7 being allowable over *Bradley*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Bradley* is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 depends from independent claim 10. Therefore, dependent claim 11 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 10. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 11 is allowable over *Bradley* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 10 being allowable over *Bradley*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Bradley* is respectfully requested.

Claim 14 depends from independent claim 13. Therefore, dependent claim 14 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 13. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 14 is allowable over *Bradley* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 13 being allowable over *Bradley*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Bradley* is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 depends from independent claim 16. Therefore, dependent claim 17 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 16. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 17 is allowable over *Bradley* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 16 being allowable over *Bradley*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Bradley* is respectfully requested.

B. Examiner Ferris rejected claims 7-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,314,269 B1 to *Hart et al.*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Ferris' remarks concerning the patentability of claims 7-18 over *Hart*. The Applicant has also

November 11, 2004  
Case No. PHF 99,598 (7790/322)  
Serial No.: 09/551,816  
Filed: April 18, 2000  
Page 8 of 10

thoroughly read *Hart*. To warrant this 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 7-18, *Hart* must show each and every limitation of independent claims 7, 110, 13 and 16 in as complete detail as is contained in independent claims 7, 110, 13 and 16. See MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully asserts that *Hart* fails to disclose and teaches away from "selection means for based on the acquired data, conditionally selecting at least an active secondary station and conditionally selecting at least an alternative secondary station suitable for becoming active" as recited in independent claims 7 and 13, "based on the acquired data, conditionally selecting at least an active secondary station and conditionally selecting at least an alternative secondary station suitable for becoming active" as recited in independent claim 10; and "based on the acquired data, conditionally select at least an active secondary station and conditionally select at least an alternative secondary station suitable for becoming active" as recited in independent claim 16.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 7, 10, 13 and 16 under §102(e) as being anticipated by *Hart* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from independent claim 7. Therefore, dependent claims 8 and 9 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 7. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 8 and 9 are allowable over *Hart* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 7 being allowable over *Hart*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Hart* is respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from independent claim 10. Therefore, dependent claims 11 and 12 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 10. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 11 and 12 are allowable over *Hart* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 10 being allowable over *Hart*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Hart* is respectfully requested.

Claims 14 and 15 depend from independent claim 13. Therefore, dependent claims 14 and 15 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 13.